

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/718,809	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner DABORAH CHACKO DAVIS	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Alex Chang, Reg. No. 52,716. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Daborah Chacko-Davis. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 25 February 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: Claims 1, and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Japanese Patent No. 2001-221908 (Furuya), and U. S. Patent No. 6,184,403 (Welch et al).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daborah Chacko-Davis/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed that the metallic reflective film of Furuya will not complex with the organic underlayer to form an organometallic compound, and that the metallic complex film does not constitute an organometallic compound, and that a skilled artisan would not combine the metallic complex film of Furuya with the ligands suggested by Welch to increase its volatility because a highly volatile film will not be feasible or desirable as a film coated onto a reflective mirror or mirrors.